UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,602	12/12/2003	Alex Lee	105479-58453 (644-032)	1632

26345 7590 06/27/2008

GIBBONS P.C.
ONE GATEWAY CENTER
NEWARK, NJ 07102

EXAMINER	
ABDIN, SHAHEDA A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2629	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/27/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

thibbits@gibbonslaw.com
abriggs@gibbonslaw.com
IPDocket@gibbonslaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/734,602	LEE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SHAHEDA A. ABDIN	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 April 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *38-59* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *38-59* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment field on 03/25/2008 has been entered and considered by Examiner. In accordance with the amendment claims 38-59 has been elected with out traverse.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 38, 42-45, 48, 52, 56-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malcolm et al. (US Patent No: 6557170) in view of Wilder et al. (US Patent No: 6557170 B1, **see IDS**).

(1) Regarding claim 38:

Malcolm teaches a device (i.e. AIU 502, Fig. 9) for producing an option menu (i.e. menu selection), said device comprising:

a plurality of image producing circuits (e.g. key board 508, video or graphical display 506), each said image producing circuit being capable of producing a video output (device 502 perform video display functions through the key board 508 and graphical display 506, column 9, lines 22 -58);

Note that Malcolm teaches a plurality of image producing, for configuring the video output of each of said plurality of image producing circuits to generate an option menu on a video display (i.e. 506) but Malcolm does not clearly discloses a processor of image producing circuit for configuring the video output of image producing circuits.

However, Wilder in the same field of endeavor teaches a processor (i.e. 30, Fig. 4) image producing circuit for configuring the video output of image producing circuits (I.e. KVM circuit) (column 1, lines 60-67, and column 4, lines 13-29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the processor as taught by Wilder in to the display system of Malcolm so that the processor could be coupled to the image producing circuits to configure the video output of each of said plurality of image producing circuits to generate an option menu on a video display. In this configuration the system would provide a high efficiency data transmission in to the video display device (Wilder, column 4, lines 30-55).

(2) Regarding claim 42:

Wilder teaches processor (i.e. 32) combines video output from at least two of said image producing circuits (i.e. KVm) for display on said video display (column 1, lines 60-67, and column 4, lines 13-29).

(3) Regarding claim 43:

Malcolm teaches wherein said device is disposed in a keyboard, video and cursor control device (KVM) switching system (column 9, lines 22 -58);

(4) Regarding claim 44:

Malcolm teaches a plurality of cursor producing circuits (i.e. 904 b and 904 a) for producing a cursor within said option menu (note that circuit for 904 b and 904 a is interpreted as cursor producing circuit , that is the circuits move a cursor around the display screen 506 in a menu either left or right) (column 9, lines 25-30, and lines 46-58) and Wilder teaches wherein said processor integrates said cursor with said option menu (column 1, lines 60-67, and column 4, lines 13-29). Thus the reference of Malcolm meets the claim limitations.

(5) Regarding claim 45:

Malcolm teaches said cursor within said option menu (i.e. menu selection) is controlled via an attached keyboard and/or cursor control device (508 or 904b, 902, 904 a) (column 9, lines 25-30, and lines 46-58).

(6) Regarding claim 48:

Malcolm teaches wherein said device (i.e. mouse or cursor circuitry) is implemented on a daughter board (i.e. rack panel) to facilitate connection to a KVM switch system (column 5, lines 1-13).

(7) Regarding claim 52:

Note that Wilder teaches said processor produces an option menu in digital video format (column 4, lines 30-54, and Fig. 4-5).

(8) Regarding claim 56:

Note that Malcolm teaches said option menu (e.g. menu selection area 1004) is displayed in conjunction with an external video source (e.g. server with video port1110a) (column 9, lines 45-67, and column 10, lines 1-5).

(9) Regarding claim 57:

Wilder teaches a processor combines the video output from said image producing circuits and cursor producing circuits (KVM circuit) for display on said video display (column 1, lines 60-67, and column 4, lines 13-29).

(10) Regarding claim 58:

Malcolm teaches wherein said video output from a plurality of said image producing circuits (i.e. KVM circuit or key board, video and mouse circuit) are combined such that each said video output (video on display) is displayed on a different section of said video display (e.g. display on AIU's main screen portion and picture – in- picture (PIP) portion) (column 4, lines 30-60, note that video outputs on the AIU'S screen simultaneously in a cascade or tilt form or PIP format, which is interpreted as video output is displayed on different section of video display)

(11) Regarding claim 59:

Note that Malcolm teaches image producing circuit but Malcolm does not specifically disclose wherein each of said image producing circuits is an on screen display- circuit. However, Wilder discloses the image producing circuit (i.e. KVM) is an on screen display circuit (column 4, lines 30-55). Thus, the reference of Malcolm and Wilder meets the claim limitations.

4. Claims 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malcolm in view of Wilder as applied to claim1 above, and further in view of Perholtz (US Pub No: 20020091850).

(1) Regarding claim 39:

Note that Malcolm teaches each of said image producing circuits (e.g. 508) and a video display (i.e. 506) having a plurality of rows and columns of characters, and wherein each character comprises a plurality of pixels (note that graphic display 506 is interpreted as a display with plurality of rows and columns of characters with plurality of pixel, which is well known in the art), but Malcolm does not teach image producing circuits is capable of producing multiple background colors , multiple foreground colors.

However, Perholtz et al. in the same field of endeavor teaches image producing circuits (i.e. KVM switch circuit) is capable of producing multiple background colors , multiple foreground colors ([0202-0224], and claim 94 in the reference).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the method of multiple background colors , multiple foreground colors as taught by Perholtz in to the display system of Malcolm as modified by Wilder so that the image producing circuits would be capable of producing multiple background , and foreground color. In this configuration the system would provide an unique color attribute in the display device (Perholtz, 0202-0203).

(2) Regarding claim 40:

Perholtz teaches each said image producing circuit is capable of displaying characters in a plurality of fonts (i.e. characters) (see the illustration in Fig. 5g, and [0202]).

(3) Regarding claim 41:

Perholtz teaches each said image producing circuit is capable of displaying a plurality of colors (e.g. 665A, 665B, 66C).

5. Claims 46, 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malcolm in view of wilder as applied to claim 44 above, and further in view of Reinert et al. (US Patent No. 5821918).

(1) Regarding claim 46:

Note that Malcolm teaches plurality of cursor producing circuit but Both Malcolm and Wilder do not teach cursor outline generating circuit and cursor body generating circuit of the cursor.

However, Reinert in the same field of endeavor teaches outline generating circuit (i.e. processor 204 for cursor control device, Fig. 2) for producing an outline (i.e. 202 cursor border) of a cursor and at least one circuit (221) for generating a body of said cursor (cursor pattern) (column 6, lines 30-53).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate a cursor outline and body generating circuit as taught by Reinert in to the display system of Malcolm as modified by wilder so that a plurality of cursor producing circuit could be comprised a outline generating circuit for producing an outline of a cursor, and a circuit for generating a body of said cursor. In this configuration the system would provide an improved user interface with appropriate cursor in the display device (Reinert, column 6, lines 41-53).

(2) Regarding claim 53:

Note that Malcolm teaches an option menu and Wilder teaches a processor produces an option menu in video format but both Malcolm and Wilder do not teach a processor for producing analog video format. However, Reinert in the same field of endeavor teaches a processor (i.e. 201 for DAC 20) for producing analog video format (column 4, lines 54-67). Thus, the reference of Malcolm and Reinert meets the claim limitations.

6. Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malcolm in view of Wilder as applied to claim 44 above, and further in view of Asprey et al. (US Pub. 5257390, see IDS).

(1) Regarding claim 47:

Note that both Malcolm and wilder does not teach a first clock for controlling a first timing of said plurality of image producing circuits; and a second clock for controlling a second timing of said plurality of cursor producing circuits.

However, Asprey in the same field of endeavor teaches a first clock (i.e. KBD CK) for controlling a first timing of said plurality of image producing circuits (i.e. key board) ; and a second clock (i.e. MSE CK) for controlling a second timing of said plurality of cursor producing circuits (i.e. mouse circuits) (see Fig. 2, and column 4, lines 1-40).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the method of first clock signal and second clock signal as taught by Asprey in to the display system of Malcolm as modified by Wilder so that a first clock be controlling a first timing of the plurality of image producing circuits; and a second clock could be controlling a second timing of said plurality of cursor producing circuits. In this configuration the system will provide a high efficiency data transmission with reduced video noise and attenuation of the signal in the display device.

7. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malcolm in view of Wilder as applied to claim 43, and further in view of Kitagawa et al. (US Patent No: 6768501 B2).

Regarding claim 49 :

Note that both Malcolm and wilder do not teach the dimensions of the option menu are variable. However, Kitagawa in the same field of endeavor teaches an option menu with variable dimensions (i. e. changeable dimension) (column 13, lines 34-41, column 15, lines 1-13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the method of option menu with variable dimension as taught by Kitagawa in to the display system of Malcolm as modified by Wilder so that option menu could have a variable dimension. In this configuration the system would provide an easy and quick data processing apparatus with arbitrary displayed portion for selecting an menu in the display device (Kitagawa column 2, lines 43-51).

8. Claims 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malcolm in view of Wilder as applied to claim 43, and further in view of Vouri et al. (US Patent No: 5648795).

(1) Regarding claim 50:

Note that both Malcolm and Wilder do not teach that the option menu is displayed on the entire video display. However, Vouri in the same field of endeavor

teaches an option menu (i.e. option window) is displayed on the entire video display (see column 6, lines 127).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the method of option menu as taught by Vouri in to the display system of Malcolm as modified by Wilder so that the option menu could be displayed on the entire video display. In this configuration the system would provide a easy and flexible data entry in the display device.

(2) Regarding claim 51:

Vouri teaches wherein color depth of said option menu can be changed using a keyboard or a cursor control device (column 5, lines 20-50, and column 6, limes 1 -25).

9. Claims 54-55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malcolm and in view of Wilder as applied to claim 38 above, and further in view of Antoun (US Pub. No. 20040131340).

Regarding claims 54 and 55:

Note that Both Malcolm and Wilder do not disclose wherein the option menu is displayed on a 4:3 ratio video monitor (as recited in claim 54) and on a 16:9 ratio video monitor (as recited in claim 55).

However, Antoun in the same field of endeavor teaches the option menu is displayed on a 4:3 ratio video monitor and on a 16:9 ratio video monitor ([0064-0065]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the method of option menu display ratio as taught by Antoun in to the Display system Malcolm as modified by Wilder so that the option menu could be displayed on a 4:3 ratio video monitor (as recited in claim 54) and on a 16:9 ratio video monitor (as recited in claim 55). In this configuration the system would provide a high efficiency data transmission with appropriate video capture with high rated in the display device.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's discloser.

North et al. (US Patent No: 6505245) discloses System and method for managing computing devices within a data communications Network from a remotely located console.

Inquiry

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to **Shaheda Abdin** whose telephone number is (571) 270-1673.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richard HJerpe** could be reached at (571) 272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about PAIR system, see http://pari-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shaheda Abdin

06/23/2008

/Richard Hjerpe/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629